arXiv:math/0611309v1 [math.OA] 10 Nov 2006

The Szemerédi property for compact C*-dynamical systems

Conrad Beyers, Rocco Duvenhage[1] and Anton Ströh

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics
University of Pretoria, 0002 Pretoria, South Africa

2006-5-29

Abstract

Furstenberg's multiple recurrence result for measure theoretic dynamical systems is proved for compact C^*-dynamical systems for which the evolution is given by a semigroup with the right cancellation property, a right invariant measure and containing a Følner net.

Keywords: Multiple recurrence, compact C^*-dynamical systems, Følner nets

1 Introduction

In 1977 Furstenberg [2] proved a measure theoretic multiple recurrence theorem which gave an alternative proof of Szemerédi's Theorem in combinatorial number theory. Furstenberg's result states that for a measure preserving dynamical system (X, Σ, ν, T)

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \nu\left(V \cap T^{-n}V \cap T^{-2n}V \cap ... \cap T^{-kn}V\right) > 0 \qquad (1.1)$$

for any $V \in \Sigma$ with $\nu(V) > 0$, where ν is a probability measure on the σ-algebra Σ in the set X, and $T : X \to X$ is an invertible transformation with $\nu\left(T^{-1}V\right) = \nu(V)$ for all $V \in \Sigma$. We view T^n, where n ranges over $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$, as the evolution of the system over the semigroup $\mathbb{N}$. See [3] for a very clear presentation of this result. We will refer to (1.1) as the Szemerédi property for measure preserving dynamical systems. Very roughly put, the proof of Furstenberg's Theorem proceeds by proving the Szemerédi property for certain special cases and then properly combining these cases to prove it in general. One component of the proof is to consider compact

[1]Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* rocco@postino.up.ac.za (R. Duvenhage).

systems, also known as almost periodic systems, namely systems (X, Σ, ν, T) for which the orbit $(f \circ T^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for every $f \in L^2(\nu)$ is relatively compact (equivalently, totally bounded) in $L^2(\nu)$.

The notion of compactness extends easily to $*$-dynamical systems consisting of a possibly noncommutative $*$-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, a positive linear functional ω, and an evolution of $\mathfrak{A}$ over a general semigroup K. First steps towards a generalization of Furstenberg's Theorem to C^*-dynamical systems (i.e. where $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C^*-algebra) were taken in [5] which included a discussion of compact systems in the case of an evolution over $\mathbb{N}$. In this paper we prove the Szemerédi property for compact C^*-dynamical systems in which ω is tracial, i.e. $\omega(ab) = \omega(ba)$ for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$, and K is a semigroup with a right invariant measure containing a Følner net (more precisely, K will be a "Følner semigroup", which we define in Section 3).

In Section 2 we define compact $*$-dynamical systems and obtain a preliminary recurrence result in terms of seminormed spaces which is used in Section 4 to prove the Szemerédi property, Theorem 4.3, for compact C^*-dynamical systems. Følner nets are defined in Section 3, where we also derive some of their properties which we need in Section 4. Our proof of the Szemerédi property in Section 4 follows the basic structure of the one given in [3], but we have to take into account certain subtleties and technical difficulties arising from working with a noncommutative C^*-algebra rather than with the abelian algebra $L^\infty(\nu)$ used in [3], and with more general groups and semigroups than $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}$. Since we work via abstract seminormed spaces, the structure of the proof becomes clearer. Essentially the whole paper consists of proving Theorem 4.3 in a series of propositions, lemmas and corollaries (except for Lemma 2.6 and Proposition 2.7 which are used only in the discussion of an example at the end of Section 2). One of these, Corollary 4.2, in itself is an interesting recurrence statement for compact C^*-dynamical systems.

2 Compact $*$-dynamical systems

In this section we prove a simple recurrence result in seminormed spaces that has immediate consequences for $*$-dynamical systems, which we will define in a moment.

A linear functional ω on a $*$-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is called positive if $\omega(A^*A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. This allows us to define a seminorm $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ on $\mathfrak{A}$ by

$$\|A\|_\omega := \sqrt{\omega(A^*A)}$$

for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, as is easily verified using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for

positive linear functionals.

Definition 2.1. Let ω be a positive linear functional on a $*$-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, K a semigroup, and $\tau_g : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ a linear map for each $g \in K$ such that

$$\tau_g \circ \tau_h = \tau_{gh}$$

and

$$\|\tau_g(A)\|_\omega = \|A\|_\omega$$

for all $g, h \in K$ and $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then we call $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ a *$*$-dynamical system.* If furthermore $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C^*-algebra and $\|\tau_g(A)\| \leq \|A\|$ in $\mathfrak{A}$'s norm for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $g \in K$, then we refer to $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ as a *C^*-dynamical system.*

Before we proceed, we review definitions and facts that we will need: A set V in a pseudo metric space (X, d) is said to be *ε-separated*, where $\varepsilon > 0$, if $d(x, y) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$. A set $B \subset X$ is said to be *totally bounded in* (X, d) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite set $M_\varepsilon \subset X$ such that for every $x \in B$ there is a $y \in M_\varepsilon$ with $d(x, y) < \varepsilon$. It is then not difficult to show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a maximal set (in the sense of cardinality, or number of elements) $V \subset B$ that is ε-separated, and furthermore, if $B \neq \varnothing$, then V is finite with $|V| > 0$.

Definition 2.2. A $*$-dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ is called *compact* if the *orbit*

$$B_A := \{\tau_g(A) : g \in K\}$$

is totally bounded in $(\mathfrak{A}, \|\cdot\|_\omega)$ for each $A \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 2.3. Let K be a semigroup. We call a set $E \subset K$ *relatively dense in* K if there exist an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_r \in K$ such that

$$E \cap \{gg_1, \ldots, gg_r\} \neq \varnothing$$

for all $g \in K$.

Strictly speaking one could call this *left* relatively denseness, with the right hand case being defined similarly in terms of $g_j g$, but we will only work with Definition 2.3 in this paper. The usual definition of relative denseness of a subset E in $\mathbb{N}$ is in terms of "bounded gaps" (see [6] for example), and it is easy to check that in this special case the two definitions are equivalent.

Proposition 2.4. *Let K be a semigroup, $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ a seminormed space, and $U_g : X \to X$ a linear map for each $g \in K$ such that $U_g U_h = U_{gh}$ and*

$\|U_g x\| \geq \|x\|$ *for all* $g, h \in K$ *and* $x \in X$. *Suppose that* $B_{x_0} := \{U_g x_0 : g \in K\}$ *is totally bounded in* $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ *for some* $x_0 \in X$. *Then for each* $\varepsilon > 0$, *the set*

$$E := \{g \in K : \|U_g x_0 - x_0\| < \varepsilon\}$$

is relatively dense in K.

Proof. Since B_{x_0} is totally bounded in $(X, \|\cdot\|)$, there is a maximal $V = \{U_{g_1} x_0, ..., U_{g_r} x_0\}$, with $U_{g_j} x_0 \neq U_{g_l} x_0$ whenever $j \neq l$, which is ε-separated. But $\|U_{g' g g_j} x_0 - U_{g' g g_l} x_0\| \geq \|U_{g_j} x_0 - U_{g_l} x_0\|$ for any $g, g' \in K$, hence $V_{g'g} := \{U_{g' g g_1} x_0, ..., U_{g' g g_r} x_0\}$ is ε-separated, with r elements. Since $V_{g'g} \subset B_{x_0}$, it is also maximally ε-separated in B_{x_0}. But $U_{g'} x_0 \in B_{x_0}$, therefore $\|U_{g g_j} x_0 - x_0\| \leq \|U_{g' g g_j} x_0 - U_{g'} x_0\| < \varepsilon$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. Hence, for each $g \in K$ there exists an $h \in \{g g_1, \ldots, g g_r\}$ such that $\|U_h x_0 - x_0\| < \varepsilon$, i.e.

$$E \cap \{g g_1, \ldots, g g_r\} \neq \varnothing$$

for all $g \in K$, and so E is relatively dense in K. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *Let* $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ *be a compact* $*$*-dynamical system and let* $m_0, ..., m_k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. *For any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, *the set*

$$E := \{g \in K : \|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) - A\|_\omega < \varepsilon \text{ for } j = 0, ..., k\}$$

is then relatively dense in K, *where we write* $\tau_{g^0}(A) \equiv A$.

Proof. Without loss we can assume that none of the m_j 's are zero. Then the result follows from Proposition 2.4 with ε replaced by $\varepsilon / \max\{m_0, \ldots, m_k\}$, since for every $j = 0, ..., k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) - A\|_\omega \\
&\leq \|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) - \tau_{g^{m_j - 1}}(A)\|_\omega + \|\tau_{g^{m_j - 1}}(A) - \tau_{g^{m_j - 2}}(A)\|_\omega + \ldots + \|\tau_g(A) - A\|_\omega \\
&= \|\tau_{g^{m_j - 1}}[\tau_g(A) - A]\|_\omega + \|\tau_{g^{m_j - 2}}[\tau_g(A) - A]\|_\omega + \ldots + \|\tau_g(A) - A\|_\omega \\
&= m_j \|\tau_g(A) - A\|_\omega \\
&< \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

for all $g \in K$ for which $\|\tau_g(A) - A\|_\omega < \varepsilon / \max\{m_0, \ldots, m_k\}$. $\square$

We now briefly indicate why the L^2 definition of compactness given in Section 1 is a special case of Definition 2.2. Given a $*$-dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$, the GNS construction provides us with a representation of $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega)$, namely an inner product space $\mathfrak{G}$, a linear surjection $\iota : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{G}$,

and a linear mapping $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \to L(\mathfrak{G})$, with $L(\mathfrak{G})$ the space of all linear maps $\mathfrak{G} \to \mathfrak{G}$ (not necessarily bounded), such that $\langle \iota(A), \iota(B) \rangle = \omega(A^*B)$, $\pi(A)\iota(B) = \iota(AB)$ and $\pi(AB) = \pi(A)\pi(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then

$$U_g : \mathfrak{G} \to \mathfrak{G} : \iota(A) \mapsto \iota(\tau_g(A))$$

is a well-defined linear operator with $||U_g x|| = ||x||$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{G}$ and $g \in K$. It is then straightforward to show that $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ is compact if and only if all the orbits

$$B_x := \{U_g x : g \in K\} \tag{2.1}$$

with $x \in \mathfrak{G}$, are totally bounded in $\mathfrak{G}$. However, U_g has a unique continuous extension to the completion $\mathfrak{H}$ of $\mathfrak{G}$, and one can show that all the orbits B_x, $x \in \mathfrak{H}$, again defined as in (2.1), are totally bounded if and only if they are totally bounded for all $x \in \mathfrak{G}$. Hence $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ is compact if and only if all the orbits B_x, $x \in \mathfrak{H}$, in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ are totally bounded. The measure theoretic definition in Section 1 is a special case of this simply because $L^2(\nu)$ is a Hilbert space obtained exactly as $\mathfrak{H}$ above through the GNS-construction applied to the state $\omega = \int (\cdot) d\nu$ on the C^*-algebra $B_\infty(\Sigma)$ of all bounded complex-valued Σ-measurable functions on X, or to ω on $L^\infty(\nu)$.

To conclude this section we present an example of a compact C^*-dynamical system in which the C^*-algebra is noncommutative. To do this we need a few simple tools, which we now discuss.

First note that if a set in a C^*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ (i.e. in terms of $\mathfrak{A}$'s norm), then it is also totally bounded in $(\mathfrak{A}, ||\cdot||_\omega)$ for any positive linear functional ω on $\mathfrak{A}$, since $||\cdot||_\omega \leq ||\omega||^{1/2} ||\cdot||$ as is easily verified (keep in mind that ω is bounded, since it is positive and $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C^*-algebra). Hence, if we can prove that the orbits of a given C^*-dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ are totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$, then it follows that the system is compact. Of course, this is then a stronger form of compactness, but Example 2.8 happens to possess this stronger property, and it turns out to be easier to prove than to prove compactness directly in terms of $||\cdot||_\omega$, since $\mathfrak{A}$'s norm is submultiplicative, which makes it easier to work with than $||\cdot||_\omega$.

In the remainder of this section we work with a C^*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, an arbitrary *set* K, and a $*$-homomorphism $\tau_g : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ for each $g \in K$. So for the moment we are working in a more general setting than Definition 2.1, however in Example 2.8 below we will be more specific. When we say that an "orbit" $(a_g) \equiv (a_n)_{g \in K}$ is *totally bounded* in a space, we mean that the set $\{a_g : g \in K\}$ is totally bounded in that space. For any subset $\mathfrak{V} \subset \mathfrak{A}$ we will denote the set of all polynomials over $\mathbb{C}$ generated by the elements of $\mathfrak{V}$ and their adjoints, by $p(\mathfrak{V})$, i.e. $p(\mathfrak{A})$ consists of all finite linear combinations of

all finite products of elements of $\mathfrak{V} \cup \mathfrak{V}^*$ with $\mathfrak{V}^* := \{a^* : a \in \mathfrak{V}\}$. We will use the notation $XY := \{xy : x \in X, y \in Y\}$ whenever X and Y are sets for which this multiplication of their elements is defined.

Lemma 2.6. *If $(\tau_g(A))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for every A in some subset $\mathfrak{V}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$, then $(\tau_g(A))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for every $A \in p(\mathfrak{V})$.*

Proof. Consider any $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$ for which $(\tau_g(A))$ and $(\tau_g(B))$ are totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$. By the hypothesis there are finite sets $M, N \subset \mathfrak{A}$ such that for each $g \in K$ there is an $a_g \in M$ and a $b_g \in N$ such that $\|\tau_g(A) - a_g\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|\tau_g(B) - b_g\| < \varepsilon$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tau_g(A)\tau_g(B) - a_g b_g\| &\leq \|\tau_g(A)\|\|\tau_g(B) - b_g\| + \|\tau_g(A) - a_g\|\|b_g\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon\left(\|\tau_g(A)\| + \|b_g\|\right)\end{aligned}$$

but note that $\|\tau_g(A)\| \leq \|A\|$, since τ_g is a $*$-homomorphism and $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C^*-algebra, while $||b_g|| < \|\tau_g(B)\| + \varepsilon \leq ||B|| + \varepsilon$. Since MN is a finite subset of $\mathfrak{A}$, and $a_g b_g \in MN$, it follows that $(\tau_g(AB))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$. Similarly $(\tau_g(A^*))$ and $(\tau_g(\alpha A + \beta B))$ are totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, and this is enough to prove the lemma. □

Proposition 2.7. *Now assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is generated by a subset $\mathfrak{V} \subset \mathfrak{A}$ for which $\tau_g(\mathfrak{V}) \subset p(\mathfrak{V})$ for every $g \in K$. Also assume that $(\tau_g(A))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for every $A \in \mathfrak{V}$. Then $(\tau_g(A))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for every $A \in \mathfrak{A}$.*

Proof. Firstly it is easily shown that if Y is a dense subspace of a normed space X, $U_g : Y \to Y$ is linear with $\|U_g\| \leq 1$ for all $g \in K$, and $(U_g y)$ is totally bounded in X for every $y \in Y$ (or in Y for every $y \in Y$), then for the unique bounded linear extension $U_g : X \to X$ the "orbit" $(U_g x)$ is totally bounded in X for every $x \in X$. (We also used this fact when we discussed the GNS-construction above.)

Now simply set $X = \mathfrak{A}$, $Y = p(\mathfrak{V})$ and $U_g = \tau_g$, then by our assumptions and Lemma 2.6 all the requirements in the remark above are met. □

Example 2.8. We consider a so-called rotation C^*-algebra, and use Proposition 2.7 to show that we obtain a compact C^*-dynamical system. As described in [1], let $\mathfrak{H} := L^2(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ and define two unitary operators U and V on $\mathfrak{H}$ by

$$(Uf)(t) = f(t + \theta)$$

and

$$(Vf)(t) = e^{2\pi i t} f(t)$$

for $f \in \mathfrak{H}$, where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ (though the interesting case is $\theta \in \mathbb{Q}$). These operators satisfy

$$UV = e^{2\pi i\theta} VU. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the C^*-algebra generated by U and V. Note that $\mathfrak{A}$ is noncommutative because of (2.2). Then, as shown in [1], there is a unique trace ω on $\mathfrak{A}$, i.e. a state with $\omega(AB) = \omega(BA)$ (we will return to traces in Section 4). Define $\tau : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ by $\tau(A) = U^*AU$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, then τ is a $*$-isomorphism and therefore $||\tau(A)|| = ||A||$, since $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C^*-algebra. Also, since ω is a trace and U is unitary, $\|\tau(A)\|_\omega = \|A\|_\omega$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. Hence $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, \mathbb{N})$ is a C^*-dynamical system, where by slight abuse of notation τ here denotes the function $n \mapsto \tau^n$ as well, to fit it into Definition 2.1's notation.

We now show that $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, \mathbb{N})$ is compact: It is trivial that $(\tau^n(U)) = (U)$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$. Furthermore, $\tau^n(V) = (U^*)^n VU^n = e^{-2\pi in\theta} V$ by (2.2). Since the unit circle is compact, it follows that $(\tau^n(V))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$. From Proposition 2.7 with $\mathfrak{V} = \{U, V\}$ we conclude that $(\tau^n(A))$ is totally bounded in $\mathfrak{A}$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. In particular the C^*-dynamical system $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, \mathbb{N})$ is compact. Similarly $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, \mathbb{Z})$ is compact.

3 Følner nets

In this section we define Følner nets in an abstract setting (see [4] for some discussion in the more specific case of topological groups) and present a number of facts regarding these nets leading to Proposition 3.6 which we will need to prove our main result, Theorem 4.3, in the next section.

To simplify statements of definitions and results in the sequel we introduce the following terminology: A triple (K, Σ, μ) with K a semigroup, Σ a σ-algebra in K, and μ a positive measure on Σ, will be called a *measure semigroup*. When μ is right invariant, i.e. $Vg \in \Sigma$ and $\mu(Vg) = \mu(V)$ for $V \in \Sigma$ and $g \in K$, we say that (K, Σ, μ) is *right invariant*. When we say that a net (Λ_α) has some property for α "large enough", then we mean that there is a β in the directed set such that the property holds for all $\alpha \geq \beta$.

Definition 3.1. Let (K, Σ, μ) be a measure semigroup such that $g\Lambda \in \Sigma$ for all $g \in K$ and $\Lambda \in \Sigma$. A net (Λ_α) in Σ is called a *Følner net* in (K, Σ, μ) if $0 < \mu(\Lambda_\alpha) < \infty$ for α large enough and

$$\lim_\alpha \frac{\mu\left(\Lambda_\alpha \Delta (g\Lambda_\alpha)\right)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} = 0$$

for all $g \in K$. When these conditions are satisfied, in particular such a net (Λ_α) exists, and furthermore K has the right cancellation property (i.e.

$g_1h = g_2h \Rightarrow g_1 = g_2$), μ is right invariant, and lastly, if $V \subset K$ with $Vg \in \Sigma$ for some $g \in K$ implies that $V \in \Sigma$, then we will call (K, Σ, μ) a *Følner semigroup*.

Simple examples of (abelian) Følner semigroups are $\mathbb{N}$ with the counting measure, and $[0, \infty)$, the first quadrant in $\mathbb{R}^2$, etc., with Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 3.2. *Consider a right invariant measure semigroup (K, Σ, μ) which has the right cancellation property and contains a Følner net (Λ_α). Take any $g_\alpha \in K$ for each α in the directed set of the net. Then the net*

$$(\Lambda_\alpha g_\alpha)$$

is also a Følner net in (K, Σ, μ).

Proof. Since K has the right cancellation property, we have $(Ag)\Delta(Bg) = (A\Delta B)g$ for all $A, B \subset K$ and $g \in K$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu\left((\Lambda_\alpha g_\alpha)\Delta(g(\Lambda_\alpha g_\alpha))\right)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha g_\alpha)} &= \frac{\mu\left((\Lambda_\alpha \Delta(g\Lambda_\alpha))g_\alpha\right)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha g_\alpha)} \\ &= \frac{\mu\left(\Lambda_\alpha \Delta(g\Lambda_\alpha)\right)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \\ &\longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

with respect to α. $\square$

Definition 3.3. Let (K, Σ, μ) be a measure semigroup. Let (Λ_α) be a net in Σ with $0 < \mu(\Lambda_\alpha) < \infty$ for α large enough. Consider any $V \in \Sigma$ and set

$$D_{(\Lambda_\alpha)}(V) := \lim_\alpha \left[\inf\left\{\frac{\mu(\Lambda_\beta \cap V)}{\mu(\Lambda_\beta)} : \beta \geq \alpha\right\}\right] \equiv \liminf_\alpha \frac{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha \cap V)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)}.$$

If $D_{(\Lambda_\alpha)}(V) > 0$, then we say that V has *positive lower density relative to* (Λ_α).

It is easily checked that $D_{(\Lambda_\alpha)}(V)$ in this definition always exists.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (K, Σ, μ) be a right invariant measure semigroup. Assume that if $V \subset K$ and $Vg \in \Sigma$ for some $g \in K$, then $V \in \Sigma$. Let $E \in \Sigma$ be relatively dense in K. Then there exists an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_r \in K$ such that the following holds: for each $B \in \Sigma$ with $\mu(B) < \infty$ there exists a $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that*

$$\mu((Bg_j) \cap E) \geq \frac{1}{r}\mu(B).$$

Proof. Let $g_1, ..., g_r$ be given by Definition 2.3. Set $B_j := \{b \in B : bg_j \in E\}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, r$, so $B_j g_j = (Bg_j) \cap E \in \Sigma$ and hence $B_j \in \Sigma$. Now, for any $b \in B$ we know from Definition 2.3 that $E \cap \{bg_1, \ldots, bg_r\} \neq \varnothing$. So $bg_j \in E$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$, i.e. $b \in B_j$. Hence $B = \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} B_j$ and therefore

$$\mu(B) = \mu(\bigcup_{j=1}^{r} B_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu(B_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu(B_j g_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mu((Bg_j) \cap E)$$

from which the conclusion follows. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let (K, Σ, μ) be a Følner semigroup. Let $E \in \Sigma$ be relatively dense in K. Then E has positive lower density relative to some Følner net in (K, Σ, μ).*

Proof. Consider any Følner net (Λ_α) in (K, Σ, μ), then for α large enough we have $0 < \mu(\Lambda_\alpha) < \infty$ and we will now work only with such α's without loss of generality. Let $g_1, \ldots, g_r \in K$ be as in Definition 2.3. For each α it follows from Lemma 3.4 that there exists a $j(\alpha) \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that

$$\frac{\mu((\Lambda_\alpha g_{j(\alpha)}) \cap E)}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha g_{j(\alpha)})} \geq \frac{1}{r}$$

where we also made use of $\mu(\Lambda_\alpha g_{j(\alpha)}) = \mu(\Lambda_\alpha)$. But it follows from Lemma 3.2 that (Λ'_α) given by $\Lambda'_\alpha := \Lambda_\alpha g_{j(\alpha)}$ is a Følner net in (K, Σ, μ). Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{(\Lambda'_\alpha)}(E) &= \liminf_\alpha \frac{\mu(\Lambda'_\alpha \cap E)}{\mu(\Lambda'_\alpha)} \\ &= \lim_\alpha \left[\inf \left\{ \frac{\mu(\Lambda'_\beta \cap E)}{\mu(\Lambda'_\beta)} : \beta \geq \alpha \right\} \right] \\ &\geq \lim_\alpha \frac{1}{r} \\ &= \frac{1}{r}. \ \square \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.6. *Let (K, Σ, μ) be a Følner semigroup, and $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ a Σ-measurable function with $f \geq 0$. Assume that $f(g) \geq a$ for some $a > 0$ and all g in some relatively dense $E \in \Sigma$ in K. Then there exists a Følner net (Λ_α) in (K, Σ, μ) such that*

$$\liminf_\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \int_{\Lambda_\alpha} f d\mu > 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 there exists a Følner net (Λ_α) in (K, Σ, μ) such that

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \int_{\Lambda_\alpha} f d\mu &\geq \liminf_\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \int_{\Lambda_\alpha \cap E} f d\mu \\ &\geq \liminf_\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \int_{\Lambda_\alpha \cap E} a \ dg \\ &= a D_{(\Lambda_\alpha)}(E) \\ &> 0. \ \square\end{aligned}$$

4 The Szemerédi property

We now put the work of the previous two sections together to prove the Szemerédi property for compact C^*-dynamical systems as defined in Definition 2.1. The first two results below are independent of Følner nets and the results of Section 3, and hence hold in a more general context than the third and final result, Theorem 4.3 (the Szemerédi property), which rests on all that went before it, except Lemma 2.6 and Proposition 2.7.

We will work with a C^*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ and take ω to be a positive linear functional on $\mathfrak{A}$. It then follows that ω is bounded, and without loss we can assume that $||\omega|| = 1$ (the case $\omega = 0$ being trivial), i.e. ω is a *state* on $\mathfrak{A}$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$|\omega(AB)| \leq ||A^*||_\omega \, ||B||_\omega \leq \sqrt{||AA^*||} \, ||B||_\omega = ||A|| \, ||B||_\omega$$

A *trace* is defined to be a state ω on a C^*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ such that $\omega(AB) = \omega(BA)$ for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$. Note that from the previous inequality we then we have

$$|\omega(ABC)| = |\omega(CAB)| \leq \|A\| \|B\|_\omega \|C\|$$

for all $A, B, C \in \mathfrak{A}$. This fact is used in the proof of Proposition 4.1, along with the following identity which holds in any algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ and is easily verified by induction:

$$\prod_{j=0}^{k} a_j - \prod_{j=0}^{k} b_j = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\prod_{l=0}^{j-1} a_l \right) (a_j - b_j) \left(\prod_{l=j+1}^{k} b_l \right)$$

for any $a_j, b_j \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a C^*-algebra and ω a trace on $\mathfrak{A}$. Suppose that $b \in A^+$, $\|b\| \leq 1$ and $\omega(b) > 0$. Let $k \in N \cup \{0\}$, then $\omega(b^{k+1}) > 0$ so we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \omega(b^{k+1})/(k+1)$. Set $a := \omega(b^{k+1}) - (k+1)\varepsilon$.*

Consider $c_0, \ldots, c_k \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\|c_j\| \leq 1$ and $\|c_j - b\|_\omega < \varepsilon$ for $j = 0, \ldots, k$. Then

$$\left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} c_j \right) \right| > a > 0.$$

Proof. We have $\omega(b^{k+1}) > 0$ by using the Gelfand representation of the abelian C^*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ generated by b, restricting ω to $\mathfrak{B}$ and then using Riesz's theorem to represent ω by a positive measure on the locally compact Hausdorff space appearing in the Gelfand representation. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} c_j \right) - \omega(b^{k+1}) \right| &= \left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} c_j - \prod_{j=0}^{k} b \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \omega \left(\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\prod_{l=0}^{j-1} c_l \right) (c_j - b) \left(\prod_{l=j+1}^{k} b \right) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\left\| \prod_{l=0}^{j-1} c_l \right\| \|c_j - b\|_\omega \left\| b^{k-j} \right\| \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k} \|c_j - b\|_\omega \\
&< (k+1)\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} c_j \right) \right| > \omega(b^{k+1}) - (k+1)\varepsilon = a > 0. \ \square$$

Corollary 4.2. *Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ be a compact C^*-dynamical system with ω a trace. Suppose that $A \in \mathfrak{A}^+$, and $\omega(A) > 0$. Take any $m_0, \ldots, m_k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then there exists a relatively dense set E in K and an $a > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} \tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) \right) \right| > a \tag{4.1}$$

for all $g \in E$.

Proof. Since $\omega(A) > 0$, $||A|| > 0$, so we can set $b := A/\,||A||$. For $c_j := \tau_{g^{m_j}}(b)$ we have $||c_j|| \leq ||b|| = 1$, so from Lemma 4.1 it follows that there is an $a' > 0$ such that

$$\left| \omega \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k} \tau_{g^{m_j}}(b) \right) \right| > a'$$

for every $g \in K$ for which $\|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(b) - b\|_\omega < \varepsilon < \omega(b^{k+1})/(k+1)$ for all $j = 0, ..., k$. By Corollary 2.5 this set of g 's is relatively dense in K. Now simply set $a = a' \, ||A||^{k+1}$. $\square$

Finally we reach our set goal, namely a Szemerédi property for compact C^*-dynamical systems, which together with Corollary 4.2 form the main results of this paper:

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \omega, \tau, K)$ be a C^*-dynamical system with ω a trace and (K, Σ, μ) a Følner semigroup. Let $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ with $\omega(A) > 0$. Take any $m_0, \ldots, m_k \in N \cup \{0\}$. Assume that $g \mapsto \omega\left(\prod_{j=0}^k \tau_{g^{m_j}}(A)\right)$ and $g \mapsto \|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) - A\|_\omega$ are Σ-measurable on K for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. Then there exists a Følner net (Λ_α) in (K, Σ, μ) such that*

$$\liminf_\alpha \frac{1}{\mu(\Lambda_\alpha)} \int_{\Lambda_\alpha} \left| \omega\left(\prod_{j=0}^k \tau_{g^{m_j}}(A)\right)\right| d\mu(g) > 0.$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.6 and Corollary 4.2 since $E = \{g \in K : \|\tau_{g^{m_j}}(A) - A\|_\omega < \varepsilon \text{ for } j = 0, ..., k\}$ is Σ-measurable. $\square$

Note that if for example K is a topological semigroup and we assume that $g \mapsto \tau_g(A)$ is continuous in $\mathfrak{A}$'s norm, then both $g \mapsto \omega\left(\prod_{j=0}^k \tau_{g^{m_j}}(A)\right)$ and $g \mapsto \|\tau_{g^{m_i}}(A) - A\|_\omega$ are continuous and hence Borel measurable.

The Szemerédi property for a compact measure preserving dynamical system (X, Σ, ν, T) with evolution over $\mathbb{N}$ is a special case of this theorem, but note that T need not be invertible in this case. Just let $\omega(f) := \int_X f d\nu$ and $\tau(f) := f \circ T$ for all $f \in \mathfrak{A} := B_\infty(\Sigma)$ (see Section 2), let $\tau_n = \tau^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\Lambda_N := \{1, ..., N\}$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $A = f$ be a positive function in $B_\infty(\Sigma)$ which is not ν-a.e. zero. Keep in mind that the conclusion of Proposition 3.6 (and hence that of Theorem 4.3) holds for this choice of (Λ_N), as is well known. The condition $||\tau(f)|| \leq ||f||$ follows directly from τ's definition, while $||\tau(f)||_\omega = ||f||_\omega$ expresses the fact that T is measure preserving, namely $\nu \circ T^{-1} = \nu$ as set functions on Σ. More specifically (1.1) is obtained for these assumptions by taking f to be the characteristic function χ_V of a set $V \in \Sigma$ with $\nu(V) > 0$ and setting $m_j = j$

Lastly we note that Corollary 4.2 already contains much of the interesting information regarding recurrence in a compact system, but under more general conditions than Theorem 4.3. In the measure theoretic case in the previous paragraph the inequality (4.1) becomes

$$\nu\left(T^{-m_0 n} V \cap ... \cap T^{-m_k n} V\right) > a$$

for all n in a relatively dense set in $\mathbb{N}$, where we have again taken $A = \chi_V$ with $\nu(V) > 0$.

Acknowledgment

The third author thanks the National Research Foundation for financial support.

References

[1] K. R. Davidson, C^*-algebras by example, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1996.

[2] H. Furstenberg, Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions, J. d'Analyse Math. 31 (1977) 204-256.

[3] H. Furstenberg, Y. Katznelson, D. Ornstein, The ergodic theoretical proof of Szemerédi's theorem, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 7 (1982) 527-552.

[4] F. P. Greenleaf, Invariant means on topological groups, van Nostrand, New York, 1969.

[5] C.P. Niculescu, A. Ströh, L. Zsidó, Noncommutative extensions of classical and multiple recurrence theorems, J. Operator Theory 50 (2003) 3-52.

[6] K. Petersen, Ergodic theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983.